

In Re Application Of: Brian G. Agee et al.	Examiner: Blanche Wong
Serial No. 09/787,789 09,878,189	Group Art Unit: 2616
Filed: 06/10/2001	Atty. Docket No:
For: Method and Appara...	Date: Jul. 28th, 2006

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 05/02/2006.

CLAIMS OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-112, 115-179, 182 and 183 were rejected under 35 USC §112 as indefinite.

Claims 1, 2, 41, 101, and 108 were rejected on the grounds that “it is unclear whether claim 1 is a method of an apparatus claim”[sic]. A telephone conversation with the Examiner (and common sense) clarified that the word “of” was intended to be “or”.

These claims have been amended to address and resolve this issue. Claims 1, 2, 41, and 108 are now distinctly “method” claims, with the steps of the method being indicated through specific gerunds (e.g. Claim 1, “organizing...linking...transmitting...processing...and dynamically adapting...”). Claim 101 and new claims 184-187 are now distinctly “apparatus” claims, with the elements of the apparatus being indicated through specific noun and noun phrases (e.g. Claim 101, “a...network...a set of nodes...means for...means for...means for...”).

Certain dependent claims (19-20, 23-25, and 60) were amended to match the amendments of the independent method claim upon which they depended, to ensure that each dependent method claim was dependent solely upon a preceding, independent, method claim.